

DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 286 389

HE 020 109

AUTHOR Sanford, Terry
TITLE Bassett to Kemp: Academic Freedom Today. The Eighth Earl V. Pullias Lecture in Higher and Postsecondary Education, 1986.
INSTITUTION University of Southern California, Los Angeles. Dept. of Higher and Postsecondary Education.
PUB DATE 86
NOTE 26p.
PUB TYPE Viewpoints (120) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Freedom; Case Studies; *Censorship; *College Faculty; Educational Environment; *Educational History; Faculty College Relationship; Freedom of Speech; Government School Relationship; Higher Education; *Professional Autonomy; *Teacher Rights

ABSTRACT

The background on academic freedom in the United States and the current situation are discussed by former North Carolina Governor and Duke University President Terry Sanford. Academic freedom had not been established in the United States even as late as the beginning of the 20th century. In fact, the meaning of academic freedom or faculty rights was not clearly understood as the century turned. Three case studies are recounted: (1) John Spencer Bassett, a history professor at Duke, then Trinity College, who wrote an article in 1903 about the treatment of blacks; (2) Edward A. Ross, a faculty member at Stanford University in 1900 who defended Eugene V. Debs' actions/words; and (3) Jan Kemp, a professor at the University of Georgia in 1983 who taught remedial programs to athletes and who spoke out on corruption in the program. Today there is a trend toward: government regulation of scholarly activities, disruption and harassment of controversial speakers on campus, proposed surveillance of professors, and continuing college violations of academic freedom. It is suggested that faculty members have a duty, not just a right, to pursue controversial and untried propositions. (SW)

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *

ED286389

Earl V. Pullias

Lecture In Higher Education

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS
MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Leshie Wilbur
Univ of Southern
California

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES
INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as
received from the person or organization
originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve
reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this docu-
ment do not necessarily represent official
OERI position or policy.

University of Southern California

1986

Terry Sanford

HE 020 109

THE 1986 PULLIAS LECTURE

by

Terry Sanford
President Emeritus
Duke University

**The Eighth Earl V. Pullias Lecture in Higher
and Postsecondary Education**

1986

Published by the Pullias Lectureship Endowment Fund, the
Department of Higher and Postsecondary Education, School
of Education, University of Southern California, Los
Angeles, California 90089-0031.

"Higher education carries a heavy responsibility in modern society. No institution has greater opportunities to contribute significantly to the upward movement which modern man must



achieve. Higher education at its best is the only institution in modern society that is free to seek answers to all the problems that confront man, through the use of every method the mind of man can conceive. By its very nature the primary allegiance of higher education is to truth: its discovery, its wide dissemination, and its effective application to the questions of life."

Earl V. Pullias in
Toward Excellence in College Teaching

Earl V. Pullias is professor emeritus at the University of Southern California. He has been a teacher, administrator, and consultant. He remains an active civic leader. A graduate of Cumberland University (Tennessee), he earned a masters at University of Chicago, and then a Ph.D. from Duke University. After initial work as a psychologist, he came to Pepperdine College as a professor, and shortly after, Dean of the Faculty. In 1957, he came to the University of Southern California to establish the Department of Higher and Postsecondary Education.

He is a prolific writer, with efforts in the last twenty years directed towards the philosophical issues in the higher learning. Dr. Pullias has published more than 100 research and theoretical articles and reviews. His book (with James D. Young) *A Teacher is Many Things* has been translated into nine languages and received international recognition. Other works include *Towards Excellence in College Teaching* (with Aileene Lockhart), *A Search for Understanding*, and his last work, *A Common Sense Philosophy for Modern Man: A Search for Fundamentals*.

He and his wife, Pauline, live in Los Angeles.

THE PULLIAS LECTURESHIP...

As Professor Earl V. Pullias approached emeritus status, many of his former students and friends asked for an opportunity to express tangibly their affection and respect. Professor Pullias expressed a desire to have these efforts directed towards establishing a lectureship in the Department of Higher and Postsecondary Education and School of Education at the University of Southern California.

The Department was first formed in 1961 with Professor Pullias as its chairman. Since that time, over 400 students have received their doctorates from the Department.

The Lectureship was arranged to bring a nationally recognized scholar to the campus that would augment Departmental programs for the faculty and student environment. The publication and national dissemination of the lectureship presentations was designed to add to the ongoing academic dialogue on significant topics in higher and postsecondary education.

A Steering Committee has served to initiate the Pullias Lectureship and was composed of Dr. Leslie Wilbur, University of Southern California; Dr. Roger Hendrix, University of Southern California; Dr. William Millington, University of Southern California; Dr. Clive L. Grafton, University of Southern California; Dr. Virginia Pfiffner, El Camino College; Dr. Viktor Christensen, Loma Linda University; Dr. Hamilton Maddaford, El Camino College; Dr. John Grande, Glendale College; Dr. Robert Rupert, Los Angeles Unified School District; Dr. David Leveille, California State University and Colleges; Dr. James Young, California State University, Fullerton; Dr. Wayne Frarie, University of Southern California; Dr. John Cashin, Santa Monica College; Mrs. Nell Privett.

INTRODUCTION OF DR. TERRY SANFORD
Pullias Lecturer for 1986
University of Southern California
March 1, 1986

by James H. Zumberge
President
University of Southern California

It is a genuine pleasure and distinct honor for me to introduce the Pullias Lecturer for 1986, Dr. Terry Sanford. Actually, Dr. Stanford is no stranger to USC because he was the guest speaker at the Educare Annual Dinner in 1964. We are delighted to have him back for an encore, twenty-two years later.

When Dr. Sanford retired from Duke University after 15 years as its President, he ended the third of three distinguished careers. The first began when he was admitted to the North Carolina Bar after earning a law degree from the University of North Carolina in 1946. The second began with his occupancy of the governor's mansion when he was elected Governor of North Carolina in 1961. And the third began with his appointment to the Presidency of Duke University in Durham in 1969. This remarkable combination of law, public affairs, and education defines the characteristics of our speaker, and explains why a writer in a Duke alumni publication wrote: "Terry Sanford leaves a university that seems more sure of itself than when he came, and certainly a lot less turbulent."

Dr. Sanford guided Duke through some tough economic times, but because of his forthright leadership, today Duke stands tall in the ranks of private universities in America. A former Duke trustee said of him that "... he has tremendous instinct to know which way to go." These words related to one of the most difficult tasks that Dr. Sanford accomplished during his tenure at Duke; the merging of Duke's men's and women's colleges in 1972. You would have to have been a student at Duke in the pre-merger days — as I was in 1943 and 44 — to appreciate the magnitude of that achievement.

But some say his most outstanding accomplishment was the close relationship he developed with the student body. A

former president of the Associated Students of Duke said that Terry Sanford "...has one of the most open of open-door policies I've ever heard of in a university president."

Dr. Sanford is also credited with forging a strong town and gown relationship in Durham, North Carolina, where Duke is located. In this he has been helped by his wife of 44 years, Margaret Rose Sanford. The Sanfords' two children, Betsy and Terry, Jr., still reside in Durham.

I said earlier that Dr. Sanford has enjoyed three successful careers, but at dinner this evening, he reminded me that he has embarked on his fourth. In January, he filed as a candidate for the United States Senate from the State of North Carolina.

There is much more to say about Terry Sanford's career, but the gaps I have omitted are all recorded in a lengthy entry in the current edition of *Who's Who in America*. I think I have given you enough flavor of Terry Sanford in this brief introduction that will make you sit up and take notice when he steps to the rostrum.

There is one more point, however, that makes Dr. Sanford's appearance here particularly special. It was fifty years ago this spring that Professor Pullias received his doctorate from Duke University.

Ladies and gentlemen, will you please join me in a warm welcome to this most respected gentleman from North Carolina: a successful lawyer, a two-term governor, and a distinguished scholar-administrator, Dr. Terry Sanford.



BASSETT TO KEMP: ACADEMIC FREEDOM TODAY

By
Terry Sanford
President Emeritus, Duke University

President Zumberge, my valued colleague whose wisdom I have observed in the national efforts to promote higher education; Dr. Pullias, whose distinguished record of service to education is highlighted by his inspired leadership at this University; faculty; students; graduates; and friends of the Earl V. Pullias Lectureship: It is an honor to be taking part in the 1986 Pullias Lecture at the University of Southern California, a sister institution similar in purpose to my own. I am particularly happy to be here to celebrate this occasion with Dr. Earl Pullias, because fifty years ago this spring he received his Ph.D. degree from Duke University. This annual Lectureship honors our distinguished teacher, author, administrator, and founding chairman of this University's Department of Higher and Postsecondary Education, and inspires all educators to lift their eyes to the long future, to accept lively new ideas, and to advance higher education to stay in the lead of a changing society.

I have taken my text for this lecture from the insightful book by Professors Earl V. Pullias and Leslie Wilbur, *Principles and Values for College and University Administration*: "The spirit and practice of freedom are the essence of the higher learning." This philosophy, which over the years has guided American higher education generally in all of its changing aspects, is the matrix for the freedom most essential to the institution: academic freedom. That essence has not always been at full strength—not in the beginning of this free nation, and not now.

There has been considerable commentary in the last few weeks because of a jury verdict based on the firing of a professor at the University of Georgia. The newspapers generally missed the real point of the case, reporting it almost exclusively as a story about favoritism for athletes. *Time* magazine preceded its story with the headline, "Blowing the Whistle on Georgia: A jury in Atlanta calls the University way off side." The real point in the case of Professor Jan Kemp was academic freedom, the freedom to rock the boat—to express

unpopular opinion, to question authority—in an academic setting in pursuit of the academic enterprise.

The trial and judgment of \$2.5 million to Professor Kemp addressed the violation of her right of free speech, an inclusive right guaranteed her as a faculty member by the ethic of academic freedom. Professor Kemp charged that she had been ordered to change grades, that she was demoted in rank after speaking out on corruption in the remedial program in which she taught, and that she was fired in 1983.

A distressing aspect is that some university administrators, athletic personnel, and Georgia political leaders, even in the face of the jury verdict, defended the actions of the University both in permitting low academic standards for some athletes, and in asserting the right to fire a troublesome faculty member who was offended by seeing truth offended. All of that is but one example. There are too many examples of an unwillingness of scholarly communities to have the courage to adhere to their self-proclaimed standards of academic freedom.

Today there is a disturbing trend toward unwarranted government regulation of scholarly activities, toward disruption and harassment of controversial speakers on campus, toward proposed surveillance of professors by something called "Accuracy in Academia," and toward continuing university and college violations of academic freedom as evidenced in the Kemp case, and in yet other ways. We will do well to remember President Hanna Gray's warning that "like all important freedoms... academic freedom is never automatic."

Academic freedom has always been difficult to define and even more difficult to explain both within the Academy and in society generally. It is analogous to the situation of the judge in an obscenity case who said he could not define obscenity but he knew it when he saw it. In the case of academic freedom, however, the recognition is often as obscure as the definition. From the earliest beginnings of higher education, people in authority have been attempting to control the statements and thinking and teachings of people engaged in teaching. In fact, the Academy's purpose began with the idea that it was to preserve dogma. It took the Reformation in the 16th century to begin a gradual change in that purpose so that liberal thought was to be cherished and promoted.

Academic freedom was not brought to the colonies with the Pilgrims, nor did it spring full bloom with the establishment of colleges in the New World. Just the opposite was the rule. In the 17th century, President Charles Chauncey, the second

president of Harvard (earlier heads had been called "Masters"), was elected on the condition "that he remain severely silent on the alleged necessity for immersion, and on...his belief that the Lord's Supper could properly be celebrated only at evening." The concept of freedom of expression still was a long way from being grasped.

Today academic freedom is regarded by many as merely a special privilege that exists only to protect the security of a select group of professionals. It is also misinterpreted by some to be one-dimensional, identical with free speech. The concept of academic freedom, which emerged in America as religious freedom for students, came to include rights of civil and religious liberty for professors, and ultimately became established as an ethic of freedom in teaching and inquiry and expression by the faculty, and all involved in the enterprise. Academic freedom today is not narrow in definition or scope or purpose. I would give it a very broad definition and scope; it creates the environment where ideas are spawned and human improvement is sought. It is a seed that has promise for every person in the world.

The standard history of academic freedom, *The Development of Academic Freedom in the United States*, written in 1955 by two historians, Richard Hofstadter and Walter P. Metzger, serves as the watershed for modern discussion of academic freedom. In the some thirty years since, all writers and thinkers have had the benefit of this thorough study as the beginning point. I do not agree entirely with Professors Hofstadter and Metzger in their suggestion that case studies are not the proper way to look at academic freedom. True, there is far more to the development of such an important principle than the "outstanding violations of freedom," but on the other hand, principles are defined and public policies are reinforced by successful and dramatic cases in which violations have been overcome by firm action and clear direction. Thus it is with academic freedom.

Academic freedom had still not been established in the United States even as late as the beginning of the twentieth century. In fact, as the century turned, it wasn't clearly understood what academic freedom meant, or faculty rights were. There was no general concept at all that a president, let alone a faculty member, could speak out on things that somehow offended the majority of the governing board.

At Stanford in 1900, President David Starr Jordan had a great opportunity to stand up for academic freedom, to define it for the world, but he didn't take his chance. Local historians apologize that he was compromising principle to

save the institution, but that has been always, and is today, the most frequent excuse for abuse of academic freedom. Jordan was a distinguished scientist, a zoologist, but he gave in to pressure on a very clear-cut case. One of his faculty members, Edward A. Ross, had defended Eugene V. Debs in his right to say what he was saying and to do what he was doing. To Mrs. Leland Stanford, Debs was a socialist who was a threat to society, and a kind word about Debs was heresy indeed. But she viewed Ross as being more dangerous than that. He also urged in an article that there be a ban on the immigration of oriental labor. Aside from its academic merits, this article was significant because "oriental" transplanted "exploited," and the coolie labor that built Leland Stanford's railroad was the kind of labor that he was talking about.

By that time Leland Stanford had died but Mrs. Stanford still considered herself the patroness of this new institution. The founding grant of Stanford University had given to the founders the power that was usually given to trustees. Mrs. Stanford was called the "Mother" of this institution, which, until 1903 when its charter was amended, was the victim of what Hofstadter and Metzger call her "unbridled maternal instinct." It was in this climate that she demanded that President Jordan immediately fire Professor Ross. Ross was terrible in even more ways. An economist, he had written an article favoring free silver, which the Democrats had used in the presidential campaign against McKinley! You can guess what that added to Mrs. Stanford's wrath. To give credit to President Jordan, he knew that firing Ross would not be a proper action, so what did he do? He transferred him, and I haven't figured this out, but he transferred him from the Department of Economics to the Department of Sociology. Maybe he thought Mrs. Stanford would not mind if a sociologist said good words about a socialist. Mrs. Stanford was not satisfied. In 1900 President Jordan forced Ross to resign, in his words, "to save the fledgling university." Academic freedom had lost a round.

The same issue was being raised at about the same time on a number of campuses. Colleges were not quite sure how to handle the matter, but most presidents probably sympathized with President Jordan, feeling that this emerging concept was doubtless important, but not important enough to get in the way of success of the institution. Integrity in most walks of life succumbs to the quest for "success."

Then, too, there was still a feeling at that time that a faculty member was somehow the servant of the institution and the

employee of the Board of Trustees, subject to strict compliance. Just a few years before, the chancellor at Syracuse, where Professor John R. Commons had been fired, had written in justification of the firing:

If the professor has the right to give up his position because of his conscience and conviction, what about the right of trustees to consult their consciences and convictions? Have not they as much right to act by their consciences as he has? Have they not the right to act according to their judgment after securing all the facts?

There were, all within a five-year span, almost parallel situations at Brown, where President E. Benjamin Andrews eventually resigned after being assailed by the board of trustees for having promulgated views favorable to free silver, and at Vanderbilt. Vanderbilt was using Commodore Vanderbilt's money in 1873 to convert Central University, a school for training ministers, to a great new university. Bishop Holland N. McTyeire, then permanent president of the trustees, brought in an eminent professor, Alexander Winchell, an "avowed, though conservative" evolutionist. After writing a tract on the "pre-Adamite origin of man," Winchell was accused by the trustees of professing evolution and destroying the faith. After a lot of discussion, Vanderbilt fired the professor. So Stanford, Vanderbilt, Brown, and others less noticed were dismissing faculty members for somehow displeasing those who were in authority.

There is another case study that I have been waiting to recount in an appropriate academic forum. When I received an invitation to speak in recognition and honor of a Duke graduate, I knew I had my chance. The event took place in 1903 at Duke, then Trinity College. John Spencer Bassett, 36 years old and a professor of history at Trinity College for ten years, wrote a literary article entitled "Stirring Up the Fires of Race Antipathy," which was published in the *South Atlantic Quarterly*, a journal that he and others at Trinity had established to encourage excellent scholarship. In the article he discussed a problem of that time, the fact that North Carolina, the South, and in fact the whole United States, did not treat black citizens properly. He predicted that in due time the Negro would achieve equality. He suggested that citizens should be prepared for it, and, indeed, help it along.

To top off the proposition, he wrote in his article a statement about Booker T. Washington: "Washington is a great and good man . . . and take him all in all the greatest man, save General Lee, born in the South in a hundred years." He suggested in later years that this statement, which caught the at-

tention and stirred up the opposition of the state's newspapers, was the only statement in the article that was a slight departure from his scholarly standards. In reflecting about the episode and his sentence comparing Booker T. Washington with Robert E. Lee, Bassett said some years later, "I looked lovingly at it and remarked to myself, 'I guess that will wake them up.'"

The Bassett Episode occurred not very long after the post-war period of turmoil, or Reconstruction, had worn itself out and was coming to an end, when "white supremacy" had been "restored" by such notables as the United States Senator from North Carolina, Furnifold Simmons. Senator Simmons had been first elected in 1900 by the Legislature, from which the scalawags, carpetbaggers, and blacks had just been eliminated, and served until 1931. He was probably the most powerful 20th-century political figure in the history of North Carolina and was also a trustee of Trinity College in 1903. Involved in the "white supremacy" continuing campaign with Senator Simmons was Josephus Daniels, then editor of the leading newspaper in the state, later Woodrow Wilson's Secretary of the Navy—Franklin Roosevelt's superior, and still later Roosevelt's Ambassador to Mexico. Daniels, who was ready for a fight at the drop of any hat, seized the *Quarterly* article and inflamed the issue, charging that Trinity College and Professor Bassett were, as his newspaper put it, out to "destroy the civilization of the South." Other newspapers in the state were not quite so subtle—they simply called him an utter fool, described him as subversive and incendiary, or suggested that he must be aiming at a chair at Tuskegee.

This kind of editorializing and furor indeed "stirred the antipathy" of people all over the state and especially in the Methodist Church, which at that time had twelve preachers on its Trinity Board of Trustees. Daniels and others demanded that this heretic be fired. There were efforts made to calm the commotion. Professor Bassett even made a statement indicating that he was talking about something in the distant future and that he certainly did not mean *social* equality, but his statement didn't calm the controversy at all and it continued to flame. Finally, faculty members, students, and Trinity President Kilgo, realizing that the situation was serious, came out strongly in support of Bassett. Even they were not willing to admit that Bassett had stated a truth, but only that he had a right to state it, which, indeed, drew the issue of academic freedom exactly where it ought to have been drawn.

Walter Hines Page, a North Carolinian, writer and editor, and later Woodrow Wilson's Ambassador to the Court of St. James, had attended Trinity and was working in New York at the time. Page wrote to Benjamin Duke in Durham, saying, "it is the best chance that ever came or ever could come for Trinity to show that it is the home of free thought and of free speech. I think you ought to thank God for such a chance—and I have no doubt you do." Indeed, it was a rare opportunity. Opportunities, such dramatic opportunities, do not often come, so Page was exactly right. Ben Duke's brother, James Buchanan Duke, who was later the chief benefactor of the institution, also saw the opportunity and is reported to have said to President Kilgo, "Public opinion can lynch a man and that is what North Carolina is trying to do to Bassett now. Don't allow it. You'll never get over it if you do." So the issue was drawn. Walter Hines Page saw such a great opportunity because academic freedom had not been established in the United States at that time. The two primary benefactors, both businessmen, saw it too. (In this respect, the president of Trinity was more fortunate than the president of Stanford.)

The Bassett Case took place in the political and social climate of the "new white supremacy" of the post-Reconstruction period, and also when the principle of academic freedom was not at all well-established. So it was in such a setting that the issue of academic freedom was finally thrown into the laps of the trustees of Trinity College on the evening of December 1, 1903.

Some trustees had to come by train from the western part of the state. Some had to come by buggy, by horseback, in various ways, certainly not by the comfortable modes of transportation that we know of today. Some had come already distressed. One Trustee, a preacher, plaintively said that his full congregation had followed him to the train to insist that this man be fired, and if this blight on their college was not eliminated, he just could not go back home. Then, as the trustees deliberated, as they began to discuss and debate the issue, Senator Simmons made a powerful statement. He was the big gun of the opposition to Bassett, or to put it in the parliamentary sense, in favor of accepting Bassett's resignation.

President John Kilgo, a minister later elected a bishop, in time spoke. It would have been a pleasure to hear Kilgo because presidents don't make speeches like that anymore. He made a stem-winding speech. It was not your calm and reasoned defense but he understood the issue. I'll just read

you part of it:

To repudiate, therefore, tolerance in Trinity College, to commit it to a line of intolerance and coercion is to repudiate the doctrines of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, the principles of this commonwealth, the spirit of this nation, the genius of the Anglo-Saxon race, and the tolerant spirit of the eternal God which has been breathed into the doctrines and principles of the Christian religion. Are we ready to do this in order to wreak vengeance? Is this College ready to say to all the world that here freedom is dead and dead forever? Are we ready to make the atmosphere of this campus heavy with intolerance, to blight the foliage of the trees and the grass of the hillside with the poison of a coercive spirit? Are we ready to change the silver tones of the college clock into wild shrieks of despotism? Are we ready to swing chains and fetters around towers and domes and pillars, and lock every hand and every foot and every tongue, and enthrone a despotism which the world thought was dead a thousand years ago? Has the Twentieth century dawned upon this commonwealth, to be marked by a deed of this sort?

That was only half a page of twenty pages. We never had a copy of President Kilgo's speech until ten years ago, when his daughter found it among his papers and sent it to our archivist at Duke.

James Haywood Southgate, local businessman and chairman of the Board of Trustees and a significant figure who had run for Vice President of the United States on the Prohibitionist ticket, was a skilled chairman as he maneuvered this debate and this vote. For one example, he had Bassett's resignation in his pocket but he wouldn't permit a vote on accepting it because it hadn't been submitted—until he got ready to submit it. He answered the expressed fears of the trustees who were in favor of accepting the resignation, by turning around the claim that if Bassett was not fired and repudiated Trinity would dry up because there would not be any more support for it and students would not want to come. He said he was not worried about students not coming to Trinity because Professor Bassett and other professors were afforded the right of free speech. He predicted that "two would come for every one that left because men will know that Trinity is a place where a man can think for himself and dare to speak the things he thinks." Mr. Southgate also said, "These men have got up here and talked and talked about the expedient thing to do. I'm not looking for the expedient thing to do. I'm looking for the right thing to do." And that was his theme throughout the debate.

The Board of Trustees debated and continued to debate into the wee hours, and then Chairman Southgate sent a delegation out to write an appropriate resolution on which the vote would be taken. They stayed out about a half hour and brought back a beautifully worded resolution extolling academic freedom and supporting Bassett. History later revealed that it had been written days before by the Dean of the Faculty, William Preston Few, who later became president of Trinity and the first president of Duke University. At about 3:00 a.m. they voted and the vote was 18 to 7 to keep Bassett. Benjamin Duke and Chairman Southgate led the way. Of course the faculty and students were backing up the Board, and the president was insistent but, in the final analysis, the benefactors and businessmen were pivotal. Colonel Bruton and Senator Simmons, along with five Methodist preachers voted against Bassett. Of the nine Methodist preachers who were present, the division of four for Bassett and five against was not bad, especially considering the pressure from their congregation at home.

Years later a graduate of Trinity who had been a student in 1903, admitted to having gone to the basement of the building where the Trustees had met, and to having eavesdropped through an opening in the floor above. He helped spread the news. Students and others built a bonfire and rang the bells, and nobody went to class the next day, which seemed to be an appropriate marking of the affirmation of the great academic principle. The statement of the Board, one part of which I will read, is a statement that has endured for the times:

We are particularly unwilling to lend ourselves to any tendency to destroy or limit academic liberty, a tendency which has, within recent years, manifested itself in some conspicuous instances, and which has created a feeling of uneasiness for the welfare of American colleges.

The trustees went on to resolve, "Great as is our hope in this college, high and noble as are the services which under God we believe that is fit to render, it were better that Trinity should suffer than it should enter upon a policy of coercion and intolerance." I must observe with regret that we have sanitized the English language since that day of President Kilgo and William Preston Few.

President Theodore Roosevelt came to Durham not long afterward, in 1905, to speak specifically to Trinity and to commend Trinity for establishing this landmark in academic freedom. His words have remained for inspiration over the years:

You stand for those things for which the scholar must

stand if he is to render real and lasting service (to the state). You stand for academic freedom, for the right of private judgement, for a duty more incumbent upon the scholar than upon any other man, to tell the truth as he sees it, to claim for himself and to give to others the largest liberty in seeking after the truth.

In 1915, the first real definition of academic freedom in America was set forth by the American Association of University Professors in a report of the Committee on Academic Freedom and Tenure. This was the official beginning. It urged academic research, adequate instruction, and the development of experts for public service. It declared the chief condition of progress to be the unlimited freedom to pursue inquiry and publish its results. "Such freedom," the report said, "is the breath in the nostrils of all scientific activity."

Today it is simple both to define and defend academic freedom when it is clear-cut, but how many times is it clear-cut? The 1915 report pointed out that the responsibility of the university teacher is primarily to the public itself, but as the membership began to examine this idea, it observed that public opinion was fickle and emotional. Certainly the "public" would have fired Bassett. The report finally said that indeed the professor's responsibility is to the public, which has to be then defined as posterity.

The American Association of University Professors, even in 1915, talked also about this matter in the context of the professor's responsibility to the student, both in helping lead the student in his own inquiry, and in setting the example. The report suggested that academic freedom meant the setting forth, without suppression or innuendo, the opinions of other investigators. It also considered the attitude of the professor toward the student, suggesting that the professor should cause the student to become familiar with the best published expression of great historic types of doctrine upon which the questions are at issue, and that he should, above all, remember that his business is not to provide his students with ready-made conclusions but to train them to think for themselves.

I do not suggest that these practices are not widely understood and followed, but I would suggest that at least those in the academic world must be cautious. I am not at all sure that we always give students the full benefit of this kind of relationship, or that at times students are not intimidated, and that free expression is not, even if inadvertently, suppressed. Students have told me they are intimidated when

they feel that if they take issue with some professors they may jeopardize their chances for getting into or out of post-graduate schools. Such a situation is, indeed, a basic violation of academic freedom.

In exchanging views on academic freedom with such leaders as Frank Rhodes, Peter Magrath, Hanna Gray, Donald Kennedy, Derek Bok, Howard Swearer, John Ryan, John Brademas, and other colleagues in higher education, I have affirmed that it is a principle still far from resolved. It still has uncertain implications, and it still is being violated almost daily, and almost invisibly.

The violations of academic freedom, as many junior faculty members feel them, come not from the administration or the board of trustees, because when issues reach those levels they are clearly defined and clearly decided. The violations come from their peers. The new faculty member, who is anxious about tenure and promotion, is often reluctant to set out on any new venture, to look for any new ground, or to take issue with established department members, believing that he or she must conform as well as possible until that magic mark is reached. Obviously, most established faculty members would not exert such unwarranted pressure, but we all have witnessed it. Frank H. T. Rhodes, president of Cornell University, expressed concern about this problem in an exchange of letters with me a few years ago. "It is always possible for a dean or a department chairperson, or in some cases even fellow faculty members," he wrote, "to try to impose sanctions because they disagree with the viewpoint expressed in either the research or the teachings of a fellow faculty member. This may come in the form of denial of tenure or in such things as salary adjustments." No matter how small the total, faculty violation of academic freedom in dealing with faculty members is the most insidious of today's violations. Those who love academic freedom most deny it most. This abuse is the most difficult to observe or to document. It blights the integrity of the Academy, and it mocks our avowed commitment, as Professors Pullias and Wilbur expressed it, to "the essence of the higher learning."

There is another real but subtle intimidation of professors, which is self-intimidation. It may be a lack of self-confidence. Do professors boldly strike for new departures and unpopular positions to establish untried intellectual concepts, or do they avoid that kind of activity for fear of condemnation or controversy? The duty to speak out and to explore new fields is sometimes circumvented by a kind of self-enforced denial of academic freedom, which is fundamentally as detrimental as

denial from outside forces.

The threats to academic freedom by forces inside the university are difficult, but threats by outside forces are rising. The American Association of University Professors' report in 1915 observed that the Academy should not be influenced by the political sphere of society, and it admonished the university not to speak as an official body on public policy. The authors could hardly have anticipated the other side of that coin, the subsequent emergence of state and federal intrusion into higher education.

In addition, the Academy is plagued by extremist, special-interest groups such as the newly formed "Accuracy in Academia" crowd. I am not inclined to take as a serious threat the "Accuracy in Academic" proposed activities, but if they are regarded seriously by the public, they will have an egregious effect on academic freedom in this country. According to its president, its purpose is "to measure to what extent, if any, the liberal bias in the media originates in the classrooms of American universities and colleges." A proposed network of students and other volunteers are to monitor university professors and instructors with a view to judging "objective truth and acceptable standards of balance and fairness." The organization pledges to review the information it receives and to publicize the alleged errors of the faculty members reported. This utter nonsense has a plausible ring to many. The AAUP has referred in their publications to these "self-appointed vigilantes" as a threat to the freedom of teachers, students, and the academic institutions themselves. The AAUP points out that this organization "intends to decry not departure from truth, but rather departure from the organization's own ideological perspective." College and university teachers are already accountable to their institutions and to the truth. The academic world and its supporters are not likely to put up with external monitoring by an organization which has questionable and biased purposes and which uses covert tactics to gather information. My inclination is to laugh them off.

Academic freedom is still a developing concept. In seventy years the AAUP has perfected its definition and observed and documented countless variations of suppression of academic freedom. In the context of academic freedom, the continuing racial discrimination, permitted or condoned at many institutions. All of us contend that we're open-minded. All of us contend that we are fair-minded. All of us contend that we are blind to any kind of racial differences, but we really aren't. We have to fight, I think, within ourselves, to ensure

that we are fair. Minority faculty members and students feel oppressed by predominately white faculties. Racial discrimination is still a blight on American society and it is still a blight on the university world. I have talked to a number of faculty members who are black and they still see themselves as appendages instead of full-fledged members of the University community. This situation is a vicious kind of denial of academic freedom and something that we can correct. We must.

In looking backward and forward at academic freedom in America, I was reminded that decisions made today continue to mark a college or university for years to come. Chairman Southgate's firm intention of "not looking for the expedient thing to do," but rather "looking for the right thing to do," is a pretty good test anytime we make a decision. Most violations of academic freedom have been a failure to distinguish between success and truth, the expedient and the right thing to do.

Senator Edmund Muskie tells of a road fork in Maine, where a tourist found signs pointing each way, both of which said "Portland." He beckoned to a farmer leaning on a hoe. "Does it make any difference which road I take to Portland?" he asked. Came the terse reply, "Not to me it don't!" In promoting the academic enterprise in our society, Americans sometimes have not much cared which road we take. They have been indifferent to the preservation of academic freedom; perhaps they can be excused because they have assumed that academic freedom is in good health, or maybe that it merely does not have much meaning in their lives. The story of John Spencer Bassett and the administration and Board of Trustees at Trinity College, and the recent story of Professor Jan Kemp, are two of many incidents of the triumph of academic freedom in American higher education. They serve to instruct us, reassure us, remind us, and alert us. Faculty members have a duty, not just a right, to pursue controversial and untried propositions, and they along with all who cherish integrity, and truth, and freedom have the solemn responsibility to encourage and to protect such pursuits. The fulfillment of freedom in the academic world does have meaning for the whole world, for even those who have not cared or noticed which road was taken. The news in recent weeks has been full of evidence of why the cause of academic freedom is everyone's concern—not something just for professors: the Philippines, Nicaragua, Angola, the Middle East, South Africa, and countless other places of unrest and danger and human yearning. It makes a great difference

to everyone.

Someday the peoples of the world will find the confidence to be unafraid of truth and openness. Dictatorships and closed societies and intolerance and repression of people are the ultimate targets of academic freedom. It is the hope of the world.

RESPONSE TO THE EIGHTH ANNUAL PULLIAS LECTURE

by

Earl V. Pullias
University of Southern California

Mr. Chairman, President Zumburge, President Sanford, and other friends of the higher learning:

Although in one sense it may not seem quite proper for me to be present at these lectures, in a larger sense I am deeply pleased to be here. This is a beautiful room and I know many of you have pleasant memories of this hall. It has a fine spirit of place, contributing to the central purpose of these lectures: a warm fellowship, helping us to rededicate ourselves to the higher learning; and a stimulation of the very best thought on the higher learning. So here we have had another excellent evening.

I am especially grateful to President Sanford for accepting our invitation to come and especially for the choice of his subject, Academic Freedom. There is no subject more of the essence of the higher learning than freedom. Before I respond briefly to his lecture, I want to say just a word about the wonderful integrity of our speaker. When he decided to run for the Senate in North Carolina, his advisors told him he would have to cancel all of his speaking appointments, including coming to speak for us. He replied that he could not do that for it would seriously damage the lecture series to cancel at that late date. And so, he is here in the midst of his campaign. I told him how much we appreciated his decision, to which he replied: "It may be that I needed the inspiration that this visit has given me." I have always been pleased to be a graduate of Duke University, from which I received a graduate degree fifty years ago this spring. Listening to our speaker tonight has increased and deepened that feeling of gratitude.

Just two brief thoughts in response to this lecture on Academic Freedom. In choosing this subject of freedom as his topic, President Sanford revealed a deep understanding of the higher learning, for freedom is its essence. Without the ability and inclination to be free, there can be no meaningful search for the nature of reality, and there can be little hope for the wise application of what is found to the problems of life. In short, there can be no clear grasp of knowledge and

little wise use of that knowledge, which is wisdom. Also, our speaker took care to warn us, as all wise people since the Greeks have done, that all freedom must be restrained, for unrestrained freedom rapidly destroys itself. The key is that that restraint in the higher learning must be self-restraint.

My final thought is that the great work of the higher learning, for which freedom is so crucial, has been greatly hindered and damaged by division or fragmentation of the reality we wish to understand. Full freedom of which our speaker spoke allows us to see the complexity of all truth, including in that search the full extent of reality from its most exact and measurable aspects in natural sciences to the spiritual qualities of faith and hope and love. Freedom from all external restraint and from the fears and distortion of internal restraint are fundamental to that search. In keeping with that breadth of concern, we close this meeting with a brief word of prayer expressing a little of our gratitude and something of our hopes.

THE DEPARTMENT OF HIGHER AND POSTSECONDARY EDUCATION...

The Department of Higher and Postsecondary Education has emphasized in its curriculum an approach to the very important relationship between the American Society and its education efforts within the higher learning. The interrelationships of thematic concepts in the development of higher and postsecondary education is a core aspect of each student's work within the Department.

Doctoral degree programs in the Department are available in a number of specializations for community junior college specialists, prospective staff members of senior institutions, as well as those already employed at public or private colleges or universities. In addition, master's, doctoral, and postdoctoral programs are available for students wishing to specialize in educational services, adult and continuing education, international higher education, career education and allied health professions. A specialized doctorate is also available in college student personnel services, in conjunction with the Department of Counseling. Certificate programs are available in adult training and adult counseling, the latter also jointly with the Department of Counseling.

Degree and certificate program developments have permitted the Department of Higher and Postsecondary Education to utilize nearby institutions as a resource of training facilities for teachers, counselors, and administrators. Wide opportunities for research have also been made available, dealing with current issues and needs within various fields. Although an emphasis of Departmental effort is with preparation of professionals, research in related fields of professional development is also stressed.

New programmatic thrusts that have been generated over the past few years include expansion of the adult and continuing education program, marked by addition of a full-time faculty member with this specialization; joint development with the Department of Counseling of a College Student Personnel Program; further development of course offerings that reflect international higher education interests; the funding of the Earl V. Pullias Lectureship, and where possible, for other services to the Department or the University.

PREVIOUS PULLIAS LECTURERS

- 1979—Norman Topping, M.D., Sc.D., LL.D., L.H.D.
Chancellor, University of Southern California
- 1980—Ernest L. Boyer, Ph.D., President, The Carnegie
Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching
- 1981—Paul E. Hadley, Ph.D., Academic Vice President,
University of Southern California
- 1982—Dale Parnell, Ed.D., President, American Association
of Community and Junior Colleges
- 1983—W. Ann Reynolds, Ph.D., Chancellor, The California
State Universities
- 1984—Clark Kerr, Ph.D., President Emeritus, University of
California
- 1985—K. Patricia Cross, Ph.D., Graduate School of Educa-
tion, Harvard University

The 1986 PULLIAS LECTURE is a publication of the Department of Higher and Postsecondary Education, University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, 90089-0031. The 1986 lecture monograph was edited by Leslie E. Wilbur. Printing was by Oxford Printing under the direction of Craig France.